

gent or, at present, chairman of the San Diego Stadium Authority, or as past president of the Urban League, or as a member of the board of trustees of Children's Hospital, or as a member of the regional advisory council of the U.S. Small Business Administration, 600,000 fewer there were few names better known.

When the population of San Diego was known and, among Negroes, probably only the late Dennis V. Allen, pioneer civil rights activist, was as well known.

Ritchey, in the mid-1920s, was a football star at San Diego High. He was a fullback whose plunges produced thuds and grunts which could be heard by the most distant spectator.

When Ritchey, 6 feet, 1 inch, 200 pounds, broke through the line of scrimmage and cut away, his cleats tossed chunks of turf across the sidelines. Would-be tacklers got an armful of air or wished they had after encountering the Ritchey straight-arm. Many a high school boy decided the game was not as much fun as he had supposed.

"He was the greatest thing ever to come out of San Diego High," said a classmate, Nelson Fisher, turf editor for The San Diego Union.

Some who remember Ritchey as Fisher remembers him may wonder what happened to him as a football player. Why didn't he become famed nationally, a football immortal, as they knew he could have been and as they expected him to be?

Younger ones who have not heard of Ritchey may be interested. They can compare things as they were and as they are. Among things to compare is the fact that times have changed enough that the story can be told, and Ritchey is willing to tell it, publicly, for the first time.

The publicity department of Ritchey's college says it has no statistics on his performances other than one newspaper clipping which has one sentence about him, "Ritchey went 17 yards for a touchdown."

But Fisher has Ritchey's college statistics.

13-YARD AVERAGE

"He averaged 13 yards every time he got the ball," said the turf editor.

The defenses of the finest football teams in the land didn't stop Ritchey, on the rare opportunities they had to try. But Jim Crow did.

"I thought I'd finish high school and get a job," Ritchey recalled. "I didn't know I had a chance to go to college."

During Christmas vacation of his senior year in high school he discovered that colleges recruited athletes, especially football players, and gave them scholarships. The two state universities of Oregon, and the state universities of Washington, Michigan and Arizona came courting.

Ritchey, aware now, recalled a week he had spent at Stanford University as a high school track athlete. He thought it was the most beautiful place he had seen, and he wanted to go there. He made inquiries.

"Stanford was not interested in Negro athletes, or students," he said. "I decided to go to the University of Southern California, because they tried harder."

He had been so casual about his studies he had to go to summer school to get some of his grades up to college entrance caliber.

As Ritchey recalls now the only reminder of his race when he was the only black of his high school football team was the attention he got from his coach, John Perry.

"He was always looking out for me," said Ritchey. "He didn't want anything to happen."

What happened in college Ritchey prefers now, and probably always has preferred, to discuss in calm good humor. Incidents one would imagine being recalled with bellows

of rage are now referred to as being embarrassing.

WORST EMBARRASSMENT

"The worst embarrassment I ever had," he recalls, "is when we went to play Washington State. The USC alumni around Pullman had the team as guests at a dinner."

"Just before we were to leave for the dinner I was told, 'You are not going.' I was given \$5 and told to take in a show."

What, Ritchey was asked, would happen if such an incident occurred now?

"The graduate manager would be looking for another job," he said. He pondered a while and added, "The university would be looking for a new team."

"None of the players, white or black, would stand for it. I was born 30 years too soon."

JONES SYSTEM

With that remark Ritchey exercised some hindsight on the wisdom of his choice of USC as a college. Howard Jones was the coach and under his system the quarterback was also the tailback. He called signals, handled the ball first on nearly every play and carried it nine plays out of 10.

Since Ritchey was, from high school to the last quarter he ever played, an almost incomparable ball carrier, he was a candidate for quarterback.

"I played behind all-Americans every year," he recalls, "and I was better."

How can he be sure of a thing like that?

"It's not hard," he said. "I was bigger and faster and I did better in practice and when I got in a game."

But the world was not ready for a Negro student in a major university to call signals for execution by white teammates on the football team.

DELAYED ACTION

That would not happen until Sandy Stephens led the University of Minnesota to the Rose Bowl in the early 1960s. Now USC has a Negro quarterback, Jimmy Jones. It happened 40, not 30 years after Ritchey.

In 1929, just before the team was to en-train for Chicago to play Notre Dame, Ritchey was told he was ineligible and would stay home. He was a chemistry major and his grades were up, so he did not understand then, or when the team returned from Chicago and he was told he was eligible again.

"They could have used him in Chicago," Fisher recalls. "They lost it, 13-12."

COACH'S BITTERNESS

In 1930 USC beat California 74-0 and Ritchey was the only USC player who did not play. What happened then would now be called a confrontation. Ritchey, old fashioned, said, "I went to see Howard Jones."

The coach, he said, told him he would never play much football for USC.

"He said," Ritchey recalls, "that he had no use for Negroes. I asked him about Brice Taylor, a Negro who had been an All-American guard at SC and he said, 'I hate his guts.'"

"I asked him why I was recruited and he said, 'Because you can't hurt us here.'"

In track, Ritchey was a high hurdler.

"Herman Hill was a high jumper and he was black, too," said Ritchey. "I did the highs in 14.6 and he could jump 6 feet, 4 inches. In those years that would place in both events in any meet and win a lot of them."

DECATHLON INTEREST

"Herman and I would compete in the early spring. In the dual meets. Then when the weather got warm and you had to do preliminaries, which we were good at because we were durable, we never got to go."

Late in his college career Ritchey got interested in the decathlon, 10 grueling events.

"The university loused me up on that," he said. One event was all he was allowed, and no big national meets.

In 1933 Ritchey's athletic eligibility was gone but he was still in school and still keeping fit. It was the year the Olympic games were held in Los Angeles.

James Bausch of Kansas won the decathlon in those games.

"I worked out with Bausch before the Olympics," said Ritchey. "I could beat him in seven of the 10 decathlon events. He was better in the shot, discus and pole vault. I think, with some work, I could have beat him in the vault."

NEVER FINISHED

Ritchey never finished at USC.

He was married in 1933. He and his wife, Ruth, now live in La Mesa. They have no children.

Until 1936, he worked as a deputy sheriff and social worker in San Diego, then joined the Police Department.

"I intended to work six months, save my money and go back to USC and finish," he said. Instead, he was on the department 28 years.

COLOR BLIND

He walked a beat. He used his background in chemistry to help set up a crime laboratory. He took the first color pictures ever admitted as evidence in a murder trial in San Diego County.

He found some prejudice on the department, practically none among the citizens of the city.

"When a person is in trouble and needs a policeman," he said, "they are glad to see the uniform or the badge and they do not care about the color of the skin."

"When Ed Dieckman was head of homicide, I was a detective and I worked all over town. Later, as a sergeant in homicide, I did detective work but I also was assigned to work with minorities—community relations."

It apparently never occurred to Ritchey to be bitter, to let bitterness be an excuse for failure or to carry a grudge against USC. He returns often to the campus.

He sees blacks on the football team, in the band, marching with the university drill and pep organizations—black men and black women.

"DUES PAID"

Some of the black football and track athletes are San Diegans who are at USC on his advice. He is a recruiter. They are there, the saying now is, because someone paid "dues."

"Jackie Robinson, of course, and people like him, are the well known examples," Ritchey said, "but we all helped, just by going and sticking it out, even if things weren't like we thought they would be."

The whole world is conscious now, said Ritchey, and the white public is willing now to recognize the right to citizenship for all.

"The black, he has an opportunity if he is willing to work," said Ritchey.

Ritchey is too thrilled to have had a little part in it to harbor grudges. He even says, with such conviction he'll argue about it with detractors:

"Howard Jones was a great football coach."

SOVIET MILITARY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT—PART III

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in two previous discussions, both printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 31, 1971—pages E3607-19 and E3672-81—I have presented materials concerning comparative Soviet and American mili-

August 4, 1971

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Approved For Release 2001/03/04 : CIA-RDP80-01601R000300340080-7

E8839

lence in a purely objective, textbook way as "activities inflicting damage on persons or property," we would be struck with the much more uncomfortable and difficult task of prescribing violent medicines to heal the wounds of violence.

There is a rich history of gruesome examples of people's willingness to use violence against people who are not members of their group. People excluded from the status of "our people," or "our own kind" are treated with moral considerations different than members of our own peer group—even sometimes to the point of being seen and dealt with as less than human.

Justifications for violence were, of course, used against Jews in Europe 35 years ago as they have been used by whites against blacks for centuries in this country. Another example of this type of rationalization for violence in contemporary thinking can be found in the Vietnam War. A Newsweek article (Dec. 1, 1969, p. 37) in discussing the May Lai incidents states:

"Many U.S. fighting men under the stress of combat display a profound contempt for the people of South Vietnam. With hearty distaste, G.I.s commonly refer to the South Vietnamese—alikes and enemies alike—as 'dinks.' And in the view of many longtime observers of the war, it is not unreasonable to conclude that the strong antipathy underlying such epithets—or the 'dink' syndrome as it is known in Vietnam—sometimes plays a part in the casual killing of civilian bystanders. 'Psychologically and morally,' says a U.S. civilian official, 'it's much easier to kill a 'dink' than it is to shoot a Vietnamese.'"

One wonders how much of the recent uproar in this country over the conviction and sentencing of Lt. William Calley is conditioned by the fact that he is so easily identified as one of "ours," while the women and children who were killed—as helpless as they may have been—are so much like the "enemy," so complicit with "them."

The study found that how men identified with the contenders in the violent scenarios enacted every day in this country did indeed strongly relate to how they approved or disapproved of their actions. Not only were men willing to use more force against persons or groups they didn't like, they were less likely to term that force "violence". The more a man was found to identify with the police, for example, the less he would call their actions violence and the more Violence for Social Control he would justify.

"These data imply," the study directors note, "that the less highly regarded the members of a particular group, the more likely men are apt to justify high levels of police force to be used against them."

People's values also add an interesting dimension to the picture. The researchers questioned the men about five basic values: (1) retributive justice, (2) self-defense, (3) person vs. property, (4) liberalism vs. conservatism, and (5) kindness. They found that retributive justice—"an eye for an eye"—and self-defense were the most potent values among American men generally in determining attitudes toward violence—kindness was the least potent: "One is tempted to say that the values that justify violence are more important in the determination of attitudes than the values that oppose it."

The study found that the more justifiable a man found the use of violence by police to control hoodlums, students, and rioting blacks, the more he believed in the value of self-defense, retributive justice, material over humanistic values, property over persons, and the less he believed in kindness.

Blacks presented almost the exact mirror image of whites on this subject. For them, the values of self-defense and retributive justice were important, but they supported violence of the opposite type—for social change. The more a black-American believed in self-defense and retributive justice the

more he believed violence necessary to change the social system. The experience of blacks in this country as a minority group suffering a history of oppression and discrimination has apparently reversed the role of aggressor and victim. Values, furthermore, did not have any correlation for whites on the Violence for Social Change scale.

With whom men identified was also affected by values. The individual who believed strongly in retributive justice was more likely to regard student demonstrators and black protesters as untrustworthy, looking for trouble, and likely to define their behaviors as violence and less likely to regard police actions such as "shooting looters" or "beating students" as violence. The plausible and somewhat frightening assumption follows that such a person may sanction strong police actions against students and blacks as a method of retribution—or "getting back at them."

The composite picture of a man who advocates a great deal of violence for social change was one who believes student demonstrations are helpful and that if student demonstrators and black protesters achieve their goals his life will change for the better. He was more inclined to regard the police as untrustworthy and looking for trouble and to define police actions such as shooting looters, beating students, and frisking suspects as violence. Furthermore, he did not believe that the police need more power, nor that the Supreme Court has made it more difficult to prosecute criminals. He was more apt than the average citizen to believe that violence is good, necessary, and unavoidable.

Nearly everyone in this study could justify some level of violence at some time. At the extremes of the spectrum the feelings for violence are most intense, most dramatically opposed; but the fact that a majority of us stand somewhere on the middle ground does not always mean that we are the peace-makers. Nearly all of us can find our share of situations where we justify some level of violence.

Breaking the cycle—freeing ourselves from the feeling that the omnipresent "violence" always deserves a violent return—will not be accomplished easily. Most of our attitudes toward violence are fed by deep, pressurized wellsprings.

One hopeful sign the study found was that with increased education came a general decrease in the level of violence recommended for police enforcement. This was true for both blacks and whites. For people of the other end of the spectrum, the same relationship exists but it was smaller—the higher the education, the less the violence for social change. It is interesting to note that the opposite was true for blacks wanting social change.

Increased education was also associated with a broadening of identifications, allowing men to see more with others' eyes and thus break down some of the neat, tight boundaries that so easily prompt violence. This is especially important since about one-fifth of the difference in attitudes toward the use of police force was due to how men identified with the police or with the objects of their force. An increase in education was also accompanied by a sharp decrease in the belief in retributive justice. Men with at least some graduate education disavow retributive justice four times as often as persons with an elementary school education.

Broadening our identifications to include people outside of our own group should also help to increase the general level of awareness of the social and political realities which prompt much violence. Doing so, the data suggest, would reduce the general level of violence: the people who rated highest on the Violence for Social Control scale believed least in the social causes of violence. But Americans generally did not mention

the eradication of poverty, discrimination, lack of jobs, and poor education as solutions to the problem of violence, even though they overwhelmingly recognized them as sources of that violence.

The greatest hope for reducing violence in this country, the study seems to indicate, still lies with the frustrating task of improving basic human understandings. The rhetoric of violence too often becomes a cudgel to subdue an opponent rather than a language to communicate with him. It still remains for a large portion of the American public to recognize that the roles of aggressor and victim are not permanently cast, but are subject to the experiences of people. Perhaps the more we are able to get into each other's skins and see with each other's eyes, the more our rigid interpretations of what is "legitimate" and "violent" will relax. Then we may begin to communicate and explore where we now react violently.

ATTITUDES TOWARD VIOLENCE OF WHITES, BLACKS, COLLEGE STUDENTS, AND WHITE UNION MEMBERS

	[Percent]			
	White	Black	College students	White union members
Violence for social control:				
Low.....	23	37	25	16
Medium.....	51	46	54	54
High.....	26	17	21	30
Total.....	100	100	100	100
Violence for social change:				
Low.....	48	11	35	47
Medium.....	38	37	38	39
High.....	14	52	27	14
Total.....	100	100	100	100

WHO CALLS WHAT VIOLENCE

	[Percent]		
	College students	White union member	Blacks
Police:			
Police beating students is violence.....	79	45	82
Police shooting looters is violence.....	43	23	59
Police frisking is violence.....	16	10	34
Burglary:			
Looting is violence.....	76	91	74
Burglary is violence.....	47	67	70
Dissent:			
Student protest is violence.....	18	43	23
Sit-ins are violence.....	4	24	15
Draft card burning is violence.....	26	63	51
Denial of civil rights is violence.....	54	40	70
N.....	(63)	(279)	(303)

SOVIET MILITARY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT—PART IV

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 1971, the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Research and Development, chaired by Senator THOMAS MCINTYRE, held an important open hearing with representatives of the Federation of American Scientists on the subject of comparison of United States and Soviet technology. A reading of the transcript of the hearing is most useful for those